1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
3 4 5	LATONIA SMITH,) Plaintiff, vs.) Case No.: 2:19-cv-00824-GMN-EJY
6 7	FENNEMORE CRAIG,)))))
8	Defendant.
9	Pending before the Court is Defendant Fennemore Craig, P.C.'s ("Defendant's") Motion
10	for Clarification, (ECF No. 84), which concerns the Court's prior Order, (ECF No. 83).
11	Defendant requests clarification on whether the Court dismissed Plaintiff Latonia Smith's
12	("Plaintiff's") claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress with or without prejudice.
13	The Court now clarifies that it dismissed Plaintiff's claim for intentional infliction of
14	emotional distress without prejudice. While parts of her claim appeared non-actionable as a
15	matter of law (e.g. statements made by Defendant when securing a temporary restraining order
16	or petitioning a court for relief), the Complaint's lack of specificity forced the Court to
17	speculate about which grounds Plaintiff intended to assert as a basis for this claim. As a result,
18	dismissal without prejudice was appropriate, which subjected the claim to a twenty-one-day
19	deadline for amendment as imposed by the Court's Order. (Order 24:2–5, ECF No. 83).
20	Accordingly,
21	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's Motion for Clarification, (ECF No. 84),
22	is GRANTED.
23	DATED this 11 day of March, 2020.
24	

Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge United States District Court

25